Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/552,377	FISHLER, THEODOR MOREL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SARAH PIHONAK	1627
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>	
(1) <u>SARAH PIHONAK</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>KEVIN MCCARTHY</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 30 June 2011	Time:	
Type of Interview: Telephonic Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes Mo If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: All Claims discussed: 1,3-5,9-11,13-23 Prior art documents discussed: All Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See continuation Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the rollowance of the interview and the substance of the interview in the substance of the interview of the substance of the interview in the substance of the interview of the substance of the interview in Part II above.		
/S. P./ Examiner, Art Unit 1627 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

A proposed examiner's amendment was discussed with Atty. Kevin McCarthy. It was also discussed that withdrawn method claims 21-23 would potentially be rejoined, if they were commensurate in scope with the allowable product claims. An examiner's amendment was approved by Atty. McCarthy on behalf of the Applicant, and claims 21-23, as amended, were rejoined with the allowable product claims 1, 3-5, 9-11, and 13-20.